

MEMORANDUM

SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS AFFECTING
TWO ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS OF CIA

The two alternatives considered are as follows:

The first is to locate the entire agency in one building or group of buildings at Langley, Virginia, about a mile and a half from the District line. The second alternative is to locate something more than half the agency within the District readily convenient to the other agencies served and some smaller portion in a different building at a truly dispersed location. It is understood that Colonel White, Deputy Director of CIA, has stated that the agency would be glad to locate some portion of the agency at a site meeting all dispersal standards.

The two advantages of moving away from the center of an assumed target area are: a) lessened risk of damage to the structure and personnel by a bomb blast and b) increased ease of evacuation from the target area. The Langley site is on exposed high ground less than 2 miles from the District line. It is about the same distance from the zero milestone as the corners of the District itself. A circle with a five mile radius will easily include the Langley site, the Pentagon, the Capitol and all of downtown Washington.

-3-

day to day contact with other agencies could be located within walking distance of the State Department and with optimum efficiency for all peace time operations.

Laboratories, long-range study projects and other functions not requiring such contact could be located well away from the District.

In the event of attack there would be fewer employees requiring evacuation from the Washington area. Regardless of damage to that area the agency would have available a substantial nucleus from which it could carry on its vital post-attack intelligence functions. The dispersed branch of the agency would be small enough so as not to constitute by itself a probable target.

There would undoubtedly be some inconvenience to the agency resulting from having a branch building at a dispersed location. This inconvenience in peace time operations might be no greater than that which would exist were the entire agency located at Langley. From the point of view of being prepared against every attack and considering the security requirements of post-attack operational capability, there can be no doubt but that to locate the agency at Langley would be worse than to locate the bulk of the agency within the District and a part of it at a truly dispersed site.

-2-

The lessened risk of damage in locating at Langley compared with locating within the District is slight. This is particularly true as the size of the installation would be large enough to justify special attention in any attack.

From the point of view of increased ease of evacuation the situation at Langley is not good: The evacuation from Langley would presumably be by Route 193 leading northwest to Route 7 and then on that two lane highway. Route 193 is too narrow to carry two parallel lines of cars at any but a slow speed. Further, the four-lane parkway would stop at Langley causing a major bottleneck at the very point where CIA personnel would be imposed on the evacuation route.

From a District site near where CIA is now located, evacuation would be across the new eight-lane Constitution Avenue Bridge and then by any one of several major highways. There would be a further distance to travel from the District but the better highway position would appear to compensate for that. In short, the Langley site would appear to have no advantage over the District from the point of view of ease of evacuation.

The suggested alternative of locating a major part of the agency within the District and a minor part in a secure spot at a safe distance from Washington would appear to have substantial advantages. Those functions requiring

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied